

R E M A R K S

Claims 4-8, 10-12, 14-19, 21, 23-32, 37-40, and 46-67 are pending in the application, with Claims 4-8, 10-12, 14-19, 21, 23-28, 37, 46-50, 53-55 and 59 having been amended, and with Claims 3, 20, 36 and 44 having been cancelled. Claims 4, 21, 28, 37 and 46 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

It is noted that claims 4, 21 and 46 have been rewritten in independent form but are unchanged in scope. Therefore, the amendments to claims 4, 21 and 46 are not believed to raise any new issues.

Claims 28 and 37 have been amended to incorporate therein limitations that were previously included in claim 4. Since these limitations were already presented for consideration, the amendments to claims 28 and 37 are not believed to raise any new issues.

The other claim amendments have been made only to adjust the dependencies of dependent claims in view of the cancellation of claims 3, 20 and 44, and are not believed to raise any new issues.

Claim 59 has been amended to correct an informality therein, as required by the Examiner, and is not believed to raise any new issue.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 4-8, 10-12, 14-16, 21-32, 37-40 and 46-47 are rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,813,769 to Limprecht et al. [hereinafter “Limprecht”].

As noted above, claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form but is unchanged in scope. Claim 4 is directed to a “method in a computer system for dispatching requests to perform services to sub-applications that use different logic models”. The claimed method includes “providing a context for the sub-applications” and “receiving a request from a client computer to perform a service”. The method also includes, for a plurality of sub-applications, “determining whether the received request should be dispatched to the sub-application”, and “when it is determined that the request should be dispatched to the sub-application, invoking a

service routine of the sub-application passing the request”. Claim 4 further specifies that “the sub-applications share the provided context” and “the determining includes determining whether a match criteria for the sub-application matches the received request”. Finally, claim 4 recites that “the requests are HTTP requests with a URL and the match criteria is a regular expression relating to the URL”.

The rejection of claim 4 is respectfully traversed on the ground that the Limprecht reference fails to teach a match criteria that is a regular expression relating to the URL of an HTTP request.

In explaining the rejection of claim 4, the Examiner cited a passage at column 6, lines 38-65 of the reference as allegedly teaching a match criteria that is a regular expression relating to a URL. However this passage does not support the Examiner’s reliance thereon, since the passage only describes in general terms a networking environment in which Limprecht’s system may be embodied. The passage does not relate in any way to match criteria.

Moreover, in explaining the rejection of former claim 3, the Examiner indicated that the Examiner considered a match criteria to be whether a server application component supports an IObjectControl interface (citing column 21, lines 25-38 of the reference). Such a match criteria has nothing to do with a regular expression relating to a URL.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 4 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The other independent claims (including claims 28 and 37 as amended) all recite the same match criteria which is a regular expression relating to a URL, and are believed to be patentable on the same basis as claim 4.


It is not believed that the rejections under 35 USC § 103 present any issues that require further discussion.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,

November 23, 2005
Date



Nathaniel Levin
Registration No. 34,860
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Five Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-3460